

religion, morals, or government. There must be a beginning and the time is now.

#### AT CROSSROADS

America stands at the crossroads of destiny. It is a common destiny in which we shall all finally stand or fall together. Though we contest with utter vigor for the prevalence of whatever attitudes and policies may possess our souls, may we ever remember that we finally must be all for one and one for all against the vicissitudes of fortune—and perhaps against the world.

We are still capable of producing leaders who have the power to move, quicken and transform their environment, and to awaken an answering thrill of appreciation and support in us who read or hear of the struggles and achievements.

I sincerely hope the "Sword of Loyola" will mark the beginning of a new and enlightened era in the United States.

Man is blessed with the liberty to choose between opposing factors, between action and inaction, between good and evil, between God and the devil. Surely our immediate situation requires an endeavor by man to raise himself above ordinary standards to a higher degree of achievement.

As Americans, we should learn to trust God, to know His teachings, and to live in His ways.

This is truly a time for decision.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock a.m. on Monday, February 15.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 15, 1965, at 9 o'clock a.m.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11, 1965:

##### U.S. MINT

Frank Gasparro, of Pennsylvania, to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Meyer H. Leifer, Congregation Emunath Israel, New York City, offered the following prayer:

אֱלֹהֵינוּ

Our Heavenly Father, we seek Thy blessing and guidance in these serious and soul-stirring times, when freedom-loving America which is founded upon liberty and justice for all, is being threatened by the onslaught of godless, ruthless, and unprincipled aggressors.

While we must develop superior military might, we must also be filled with Thy Holy Spirit to preserve the superiority of our democratic way of living.

Bless Thou, O Lord, our glorious land of liberty, our leaders, the President of our United States, and the Representatives. Endow them with understanding

to guide America to continue to be a citadel of freedom and ray of light and hope to all those who are now living in darkness.

Hasten the day when universal peace will prevail throughout the world with freedom and justice for all. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 60. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes;

S. 301. An act to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics;

S. 490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 491. An act to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; and

S. 794. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 10, Public Law 474, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. FANNIN to be a member of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration.

#### UNITED STATES v. RUSSELL NIXON AND OTHERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

The Chair, in his official capacity as Speaker of this House, has been served with a subpoena duces tecum, issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, commanding him to appear in the said court to testify in the case of the United States of America against Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson, and Donna Allen on the 18th day of March 1965.

Under the precedents of the House, the Chair is unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. The Chair therefore submits

the matter for the consideration of this body. The Clerk will read a copy of the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. RUSSELL NIXON, DAGMAR WILSON, DONNA ALLEN—CRIMINAL No. 1170-64, 1171-64, 1172-64

To Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker, House of Representatives, Room H-206, Capitol:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., in the city of Washington, D.C., on the 18th day of March 1965, at 9:30 a.m., to testify in the case of *United States v. Nixon, Wilson, and Allen* and bring with you the documents listed in the attached schedule A.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the defendants, February 9, 1965, David Rein, attorney for defendants, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

HARRY M. HULL,  
Clerk.

By GERALD C. DAVIS,  
Deputy Clerk.

#### SCHEDULE A

1. A copy of the opinion submitted to the Speaker by the Parliamentarian with respect to his authority or discretion to certify to the U.S. attorney in accordance with title 2, United States Code, section 194, the statements of fact made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to the three defendants named in the subpoena.

2. A copy of the written certifications of these statements of fact made by the Speaker to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read a copy of a letter which the Chair has sent to the Attorney General in connection with this matter:

FEBRUARY 11, 1965.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
The Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I did on last evening, February 10, accept service in the case of *United States of America v. Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen*, from Deputy U.S. Marshal Morina. I have asked the deputy marshal to present this summons and letter to you so that you may proceed in accordance with the law.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

#### BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT  
MARINE AND FISHERIES,

Washington, D.C., February 10, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1965: Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland; Hon. ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina; Hon. JAMES R. GROVER, Jr., of New York.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,  
Chairman.

#### BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT  
MARINE AND FISHERIES,  
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1965: Hon. THOMAS N. DOWNING, of Virginia; Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York; Hon. CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,  
Chairman.

#### GOVERNMENTWIDE COORDINATION OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. On July 18, 1963, the House approved H.R. 5171, to provide the necessary operational machinery for governmentwide coordination of automatic data processing equipment. Approval of this measure would have made it possible for the executive to acquire and utilize this highly useful but costly equipment on the most economical, businesslike basis. Final action was not taken on this measure before the close of the 88th Congress. The proposal I introduce today is identical to H.R. 5171 except for several clarifying amendments.

Traditionally, the House has endeavored to improve the economy and efficiency of Government operations at all levels. And, we know of the President's interest. Only recently in his state of the Union address he called for a Federal Government "moderate in structure, efficient in action, and ready for any emergency." Last May, in a Cabinet meeting, the President was more specific. At that time he told the heads of our various departments:

I want all reports made by the General Accounting Office and any congressional committee to be given prompt and thorough and careful attention. Honest mistakes can be forgiven, but it is hard to forgive failures to examine and tighten agency procedures to guard against a recurrence of an error that is uncovered by the GAO or by a congressional committee.

This legislation is the type of proposal to which the President referred in his frank discussion with his executive leaders. This proposal is strongly recommended by the Comptroller General. During the past 7 years he has submitted more than 60 audit reports to Congress fully documenting grave deficiencies in Government management of automatic data processing equipment. These support his long-standing recommendation that acquisition and utilization of ADP equipment be coordinated on a governmentwide basis.

Through approval of this legislation we will have within our grasp savings in tax funds of such magnitude as to noticeably affect the annual Federal budget in future years. In May 1963, in hearings on H.R. 5171, the Comptroller General, who for many years has followed the development of automatic data processing, predicted that Government usage of this equipment would continue to increase for an indefinite period—an increase more in a geometric rather than an arithmetic progression. In an article on automation appearing in the January 25, 1965, *Newsweek*, the author points out that this explosive growth is not limited to the Federal Government:

Last year, corporations like IBM, RCA, Sperry Rand, General Electric, Honeywell, and National Cash Register sold or leased about \$2 billion worth of this electronic marvel. There are now more than 20,000 general purpose computers in operation—a two-thirds increase in less than 2 years—and about 10,000 more are already on order.

In May 1963, the Comptroller General also predicted that ADP costs must soon be considered as an annual fixed charge against the Government which could not be reduced—comparable to the interest on the national debt. To appreciate the sums involved, one has only to consider that there are approximately 2,000 ADP systems in use in Government departments and agencies with annual operating costs exceeding \$1 billion. Many of the larger of these systems sell for millions of dollars or lease at rates in excess of \$50,000 a month for a one-shift operation. In ADP management, even the smallest mistake can be extremely wasteful.

In May 1963, testifying on H.R. 5171, the Comptroller General further suggested that adoption of a businesslike, Government-wide coordination system, as provided in this legislation, would result in savings of substantially more than \$100 million a year. He added that this estimate was conservative.

This estimated savings of more than \$100 million a year was based upon an authoritative study of benefits that would accrue to the Government through the purchase rather than the lease of 523 representative systems after an initial 5-year period during which the savings would amount to about \$148 million. Were the Comptroller General to testify today, with the benefit of additional data developed during the last 2 years, I am sure his estimate of potential savings would be even more formidable.

First, there are far more than 523 systems involved. Last year, there were approximately 1,700 systems. This year,

as I pointed out, we are talking in terms of approximately 2,000 ADP systems in use in Government.

Second, the Comptroller General's \$100 million a year estimate did not reflect the substantial savings which can result from increasing the utilization of presently held equipment. Round-the-clock, three-shift usage is generally considered as an optimum and, in most instances, a reasonable goal. The latest estimates indicate that Government ADP utilization falls far short of this goal.

Third, the Comptroller General's \$100 million a year estimate did not consider that vast array of ADP equipment acquired at the expense of the taxpayers and located in the plants and facilities of defense and other contractors. No reliable Government-wide inventory of this equipment has been made. The best informed officials suggest that the total of these contractor-held systems at least equals the number of systems used in house in Government. Other estimates place the total of contractor-held equipment as high as twice the number of systems used in house in Government.

Thus the savings in tax funds from this legislation are not limited to \$100 million annually, but as time passes will involve ever-increasing sums many times this amount. With billions in tax funds invested in ADP and with use of this equipment expected to increase indefinitely, we must provide the Government with the most efficient and effective management that can be devised without compromising agency equipment application or use.

Turning to the substance of the problem, the Comptroller General has performed almost 100 reviews of Government ADP activities. Some 60 of these have resulted in highly critical reports to Congress. Of these, four have been comprehensive evaluations of Government-wide ADP management problems.

In the first of these comprehensive reports, issued in June 1958, he pointed out that there was no single agency of Government responsible for directing and coordinating continuing developments in automatic data processing. He emphasized that his principal recommendation was the need to establish an effective coordinated program of joint effort in the Government. Subsequent to that report, the Bureau of the Budget endeavored to improve Government ADP management, but these efforts relied upon an agency-by-agency approach.

In a second comprehensive report submitted to Congress in December 1960, the Comptroller General renewed this recommendation for Government-wide coordination in ADP management. And, some 3 years later, in March 1963, he advised Congress in a third comprehensive report that no significant progress had been made toward achieving an effective, coordinated mechanism in the Federal Government to obtain optimum utilization and economical acquisition of ADP equipment.

In April 1964, the Comptroller General, in a fourth comprehensive report, acknowledged some improvements but cautioned that only limited gains could be expected from the Government's unco-



ordinated approach. He again emphasized his recommendation for a Government-wide coordination system, as provided in this legislation.

The lack of a Government-wide coordinated approach has been the principal basis for the Comptroller General's continuing criticism. Most of the costly deficiencies reported to Congress during the past 7 years either stem directly from a lack of Government-wide coordination in the utilization and acquisition of equipment, or could be readily cured by this broader approach.

Low utilization of available equipment is a chronic problem throughout the Government. As previously discussed, significant savings could be achieved by a mere increase in the use of equipment the Government now has, in lieu of the acquisition of additional systems. Experience during the past 7 years demonstrates that satisfactory utilization of equipment through sharing multi-agency use, and interagency transfer cannot be obtained without active Government-wide coordination.

An obvious necessity in any effective management program is the availability of up-to-date, accurate, detailed inventory information. No such inventory is in existence today. But, under this legislation, GSA would maintain an inventory of Government ADP equipment as well as prospective requirements and other related information either necessary or desirable for management, technical, or policy making purposes. This inventory, of course, would be maintained on an adequate ADP system. The information from it would give GSA, the Bureau of the Budget, user agencies, and the Congress the basic facts essential to the development and maintenance and maintenance of an effective Government-wide ADP program. This information would also be available to ADP manufacturers on a routine basis affording them a better opportunity to compete for Government business on a cost and quality basis.

With this detailed information, GSA would have an effective means of increasing Federal utilization to an optimum level. GSA could routinely match new requirements with existing capacity through sharing—including the use of communications systems as this new technique continues to develop—multiple use and transfers. The central ADP revolving fund authorized in this legislation would afford GSA an effective means to fund the sharing and joint use of equipment. Agencies would prorate the cost on a time-use basis. Systems could also be speedily transferred from one agency to another simply by making an adjustment in the billing rates of the agencies involved.

The Government's ADP procurement system is also inadequate under the present agency-by-agency approach. Little if any real advantage is obtained, considering that the Government is the largest ADP user in the world. First, as previously emphasized, you cannot reliably determine additional equipment needs until equipment on hand is used to an optimum extent. Then, as outlined in the Comptroller General's report of March 6, 1963, authoritative evaluations must be made as to the comparative ben-

efits to the Government on lease versus purchase. These evaluations cannot be made on an agency-by-agency basis. They must reflect the projected economic life of the equipment to the Government as a whole and not solely to the initial procuring or user agency, as has been the practice in the past.

And, having decided that additional equipment is needed and that it should be leased or purchased, the Government must then be in the best possible position to obtain the most favorable purchase or lease prices, including volume discounts. This requires development of a single purchaser concept. This in turn requires use of a capital revolving fund and the overall Government-wide coordinating authority authorized in this legislation.

Under this approach, GSA would not become a Government ADP czar. GSA would not interpose itself between the manufacturer and the user agency except in the execution of lease, purchase, or maintenance contracts. As is now the case, each user agency would determine its own ADP requirements and these requirements would be provided, assuming that the Congress has appropriated adequate funds to the agency to cover annual rental of the system to be paid into the revolving fund and assuming the Bureau of the Budget, the President, or Congress does not specifically disapprove the user agency plans.

The bill I introduce today contains an amendment expressly reserving the right of user agencies to establish their own individual requirements. The amendment also guarantees any user agency the right to appeal from any decision GSA might make which the agency considers compromises its management responsibilities or adversely affects its operations.

The bill also contains appropriate exceptions necessary for reasons of security and defense and to allow deviations from the procedure when necessary for economy or efficiency. It is not the intent of this legislation that any specialized scientific or specially designed military ADP system components be included within the confines of this coordination procedure. The ADP of concern are the general purpose systems, which I understand comprise about 90 percent of the ADP equipment in the Government's possession.

An amendment is also included delineating the technical functions of the Commerce Department's Bureau of Standards. The Bureau of Standards would offer scientific and technical advisory and consulting services to agencies generally and to the Administrator of General Services in the operational management of this Government-wide ADP coordination program. In addition, the amendment provides for the submission of recommendations to the President relating to the establishment of uniform Federal standards for ADP equipment, techniques, and computer languages. The amendment authorizes the necessary research to fulfill these responsibilities.

Any research the Bureau performed would neither duplicate nor interfere

with the research of user agencies. The Bureau of Standards would supplement agency research efforts when necessary to meet Government-wide requirements for the services stated in this legislation.

The subcommittee on Government activities, of which I am chairman, will shortly announce the date of hearings on this legislation.

#### JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, long after Members of this Congress have passed into the oblivion of history, the man whose 85th birthday is being observed tomorrow will continue to be honored for his leadership in America's 20th century industrial progress. John L. Lewis' position in the labor movement has already been firmly and permanently established, but only with the passing of years will his overall contributions come to be thoroughly recognized and appreciated.

Those of us who were brought up in the coal region have been fortunate in being so close to the scenes where—through the efforts of Mr. Lewis—the miner has experienced a transformation from a hollow, neglected existence into a respected and vital place in the community. But the reputation of this outstanding humanitarian is by no means confined to mining areas. Wherever coal is mentioned, John L. Lewis comes to mind. Whenever an article on coal is published, the name is certain to appear.

As succeeding generations pass along, the dominating personality of John L. Lewis will be looked upon not only as the spark behind the renaissance of the coal miner, but also as the answer to management-labor problems that plagued the country for half a century and more.

It was in 1950 that a new era in management-labor relations came about when Mr. Lewis sat down in quiet discussion with a representative of coal operators after every other approach to agreement had been exhausted. Out of that meeting came a program universally accepted as an ideal solution to the strife and hostility that could be anticipated when one man invested in capital equipment and another was employed by him. Since that time mine owners and mine workers have walked together along the road to a better life.

In wishing you a happy birthday, Mr. Lewis, America thanks you for past accomplishments as well as for the advantages that will accrue to our country in the future through your indomitable and incomparable foresight.

#### HORTON BILL HELPS TAXPAYERS HURT BY UNDERWITHHOLDING

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks



at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill earlier this week to benefit taxpayers facing higher tax bills. The legislation covers those who, despite the overall tax cut, will owe additional taxes as the result of withholding rate reduction exceeding the reduced tax rate.

The problem faces millions of Americans as the result of the tax reduction legislation enacted by Congress last year. The new withholding rate of 14 percent was made effective for almost all of 1964 while the tax lowering was made effective in two steps with only the first portion applying to 1964 income.

Many of my constituents are registering strong complaints with me because of the financial pinch they face at no fault of their own.

To ease the strain on those taxpayers who went ahead and spent the extra money made available by the withholding drop—as they were urged to do in behalf of the national economy—I have introduced a bill to let them spread their extra payments over the next year.

Under my proposal, a taxpayer could defer paying only the part of his income taxes that are additional because of the reduced withholding rate. Full payment would be required by April 15, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the intense interest of my constituents in his tax inequity prompted me to discuss the issue in my weekly television news commentary which is broadcast exclusively by WROC-TV—channel 8—in Rochester, N.Y. For its additional expression of my feelings on this matter, I include the text of this commentary with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The opening reference is to Tom Decker, the station's news director and the gentleman whose newscasts carry my commentaries.

The text follows:

Thanks, Tom.

April 15 will soon be here and that means income tax time. This year, many taxpayers are going to get a shock when they discover that their withholding is not enough to cover the tax they owe.

This comes about because of the withholding reductions that were put into effect a year ago when the income tax cut was passed by Congress. Before the cut, withholding was 18 percent. The tax bill dropped it to 14 percent.

This would have been all right, except the tax cut only became partially effective in 1964. Thus, wages were underwithheld, and millions of people now face unexpected tax bills.

To help out, I introduced a bill this week to let taxpayers spread their extra payments over the next year. I am working hard to get the bill considered and I hope the administration can be persuaded to approve it so that we can relieve the financial bind so many taxpayers are facing at no fault of their own.

#### CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I note in the RECORD where one of the subcommittees of the House Committee on the Judiciary has reported favorably to the full committee a bill, H.R. 970, to require the establishment on the basis of the 19th and subsequent decennial censuses of congressional districts. It goes on to set forth how those districts shall be established.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that some persons may be misled by thinking that the Judiciary Committee is taking some action on what I believe is the most important issue before this Congress and the Nation today, and one which requires immediate attention. H.R. 970 does little, if anything, to counteract or offset the devastating danger which faces most of the 50 States because of the "one-man, one-vote" decision of the Supreme Court.

While the Judiciary Committee's chairman has elected to consider legislation which would not take effect for some 6 to 8 years from now, rather than to consider some of the numerous bills which have been introduced, and which are designed to meet the emergency created by the irreconcilable decision of the Supreme Court which is causing most of our State legislatures to consider reapportionment of not only congressional districts but also the senatorial and legislative districts within their States, it seems to me that this Congress should take immediate action to counteract the Supreme Court's position. The subcommittee did amend the bill to provide for its effectiveness in the 90th Congress.

I am referring to proposed legislation, such as House Joint Resolution 64, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable RICHARD ICHORD, a former speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives. His resolution is one of several measures introduced by other Members of this House which would provide for a constitutional amendment, the wording of which has been approved by the Council of State Governments, and which I understand is receiving favorable consideration in many State legislatures, where the leadership recognizes the imperativeness of taking some action now, and without delay.

The proposed amendment to the Constitution is quite simple, and actually spells out what I believe most persons thought was provided in the Constitution, when it states:

Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

This merely means that we would apply the same criteria to the selection of members of one house of the State legislature that is now applied to the Senate of the United States. What most of

us fear, and I think with justification as long as we have a Supreme Court composed of individuals who would usurp the powers of the legislative branch of our Government, is that if the recent decision of the Supreme Court is permitted to stand, it will be only a matter of time until the Supreme Court will declare unconstitutional the present representative composition of the U.S. Senate. Certainly the Supreme Court cannot accept as consistent a position which establishes one criteria for representation in State legislatures, and permits such a wide disparity of representation by U.S. Senators. From the smug position which some Members of the other body have taken, it would seem they do not realize they will be the next target, when they will be "sitting ducks."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Supreme Court was entirely wrong, and that the Members of the other body who seem to be in concurrence with the Supreme Court decision will wake up someday to find they are going to be the targets of that decision, unless at this session of this Congress we take some action to correct the grievous action of the Supreme Court.

#### ARM-TWISTING PROBE BROADENS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carried an article by the syndicated columnists Evans and Novak commenting rather extensively on the fundraising activities of the treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. Reference is made in the article to an investigation by the FBI into the illegal solicitation of campaign funds in the Rural Electrification Administration. I was advised by letter from the Justice Department last week that the FBI had been called into the case, and I must say that I am pleased that this investigating agency is going into this sordid matter.

A complete and thorough investigation such as we would expect from the FBI will, I hope, restore the status of our Federal civil service to the nonpartisan status which is supposedly guaranteed to it by the Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act.

I include at this point in my remarks the letter which I received from the Justice Department and the Evans and Novak article from the Washington Post:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1965.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: This will reply to your letter of January 12, 1965, with which you enclosed a copy of a letter to you from the Assistant General Counsel of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, referring to an investigation of alleged violations of the Hatch



Act in the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

We have requested the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate the facts in this matter following which a determination will be made whether any violations of Federal criminal statutes relating to the solicitation of political contributions by Federal employees have occurred which would warrant prosecution. You are undoubtedly aware that in addition to possible criminal violations there are also involved possible administrative penalties, the imposition of which is within the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission and the employing agency.

Sincerely,

Acting Attorney General.

#### THE MYSTERIOUS MR. MAGUIRE

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The shadowy and shrouded world of Richard Maguire, gray eminence of the Democratic Party, is being opened up a bit by nosy outsiders.

As treasurer of the Democratic National Committee, Maguire is scarcely known even by name, to rank-and-file Democrats. Yet, as one of the most ingenious and insistent fundraisers in American political history, Dick Maguire is a law unto himself at Democratic national headquarters. He is easily the most powerful man in the national party structure.

Consequently, it is of particular interest that Maguire's fundraising exploits have attracted the attention of Washington's most aggressive seeker after sin. Maguire may not know it, but his office is now the subject of private investigation by Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, the Delaware chicken farmer with an unequaled collection of political scalps.

Maguire does not relish attention from WILLIAMS or anybody else. Alone among national political figures, he refuses to talk to the press. The records of his office are barred from the public. Even duly elected members of the Democratic National Committee hesitate to pry into Maguire's fundraising activities.

However, the veil of secrecy is being nudged aside. The FBI is investigating charges that civil servants in the Rural Electrification Administration were illegally solicited to purchase tickets to last year's Democratic fundraising gala.

If this generates a grand jury investigation, the charges might extend far beyond the REA. Civil servants throughout the Government would love to tell all about being pressured by their Democratic superiors under the Maguire regime.

More significant is the area in which Senator WILLIAMS privately concerns himself: Maguire's sale of advertising space in the \$10 a copy program of the 1964 Democratic National Convention.

Sale of program ads (usually by the host committee) to defray national convention costs is nothing new. But Maguire added a new twist. The Democratic National Committee took over ad sales, charging \$15,000 a page—triple the previous charge.

Who paid that price for ads in a limited-circulation publication?

Maguire fired off heavyhanded solicitations to a wide spectrum of businessmen, heavily studded with Government contractors.

The result was phenomenal: A \$15 million take, according to the Democratic National Committee.

But Federal law bars corporations from making contributions to political parties. Purchase of the ads would be legal only if the money were used (as the Democrats claimed) solely to defray convention costs. If any of the money were used to finance the 1964 campaign, officials at the Democratic

National Committee would be criminally liable.

National committee spokesmen assert that not 1 cent of the \$15 million helped finance the campaign. But they supply no detailed audit. Nor is such an audit available for public inspection. And, as ever, Maguire is silent.

There is still another aspect to this. Although political contributions cannot be claimed as tax deductions, advertising costs are deductible as a legitimate business expense. Hence, as permitted by existing law, the \$15,000 a page advertising costs—a thinly disguised gift to the Democratic Party—can be deducted from taxable income.

This amounts to Uncle Sam's subsidizing the Democratic Party in a way Congress never intended. If permitted, it is a practice likely to grow within both parties. For this reason, Senator WILLIAMS is asking the Internal Revenue Service just how much the program ads will cost the Government in lost taxes.

Nor does this begin to exhaust the questions that could be asked of Maguire.

What about the President's Club, a Maguire innovation whereby fat cats can pay \$1,000 a year and rub elbows with the great—even the President—at exclusive cocktail parties? How many members belong? Who are they? Why aren't all their names reported to the Federal Government as campaign givers?

To the cynic it might seem unlikely that a Democratic-controlled administration and Congress would press Maguire and Company for answers to these questions. But JOHN WILLIAMS' plodding inquisitiveness sometimes has a way of making strange things happen.

#### REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is most reassuring to note that the present administration has subscribed to suggestions that I and others on this side of the aisle have long proffered. I am referring to the now-popular idea of reducing or eliminating certain unneeded and unwarranted excise taxes. I have incorporated these suggestions in the form of bills on a number of occasions during prior Congresses.

Today I am again submitting a bill for the elimination or reduction of certain excise taxes, and it is my hope that it will be given serious consideration by this Congress.

It calls for the elimination of the list of retail excises such as jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage, handbags and wallets, and also calls for the elimination of excises on telephone service and the reduction and eventual elimination of excises on passenger cars and parts.

#### HIGHWAY FUND TO BENEFIT

One aspect of my bill represents a distinct departure from other suggestions we have heard of late. The excise taxes on automobiles would be immediately reduced from 10 to 5 percent, and the tax on automotive parts and accessories

would be reduced from 8 to 4 percent. The remaining amounts collected from the sale of passenger cars and parts, amounting to over a billion dollars a year, would be earmarked to the highway trust fund. Costs of the Interstate Highway program are running higher than expected, and my bill would keep that fund solvent, in addition to offering immediate relief to the Nation's drivers. Then, when the Interstate System is completed in 1972, the remaining half of the present car and parts tax would be removed. I consider this important, since the car cannot be considered a luxury item and must not be treated as such by our antiquated tax system.

This bill also would eliminate the levy placed against the Nation's communications systems, which is passed on to the consumer. The average household would save an annual amount in excess of 1 month's telephone bill, and the saving to the companies in line, long-distance, and other services, would mean additional savings to the public and greater expansion opportunities for the companies. Like the automobile, a telephone is a necessity in the 20th century, and wartime taxes that were intended to temporarily curtail the use of communications services should be eliminated.

The retail section of this bill calls for the elimination of excise taxes on such commodities as toilet preparations, luggage, handbags, wallets, jewelry, and furs. Not only will the elimination of these excises put more usable money into the mainstream of the national economy, but it will finally relieve the merchants of America of the cumbersome chore of acting as tax collectors for the Federal Government.

It is hoped that early and favorable consideration will be made of this proposal.

#### THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the war in South Vietnam rages on. Information filtering through to the public indicates a rapidly deteriorating situation. I say filtering through because there is, and has been, a cloak of secrecy thrown around American military and political operations in that area.

The President has ordered military strikes against the staging areas in North Vietnam in reprisal for attacks against our positions in the south. These air strikes have brought on Communist reprisals and it appears that many more Americans were killed in a raid today. Senator Goldwater recommended retaliation against Communist sanctuaries in North Vietnam and for this he was labeled "trigger happy," a "warmonger," "irresponsible," and "a man dedicated to starting a nuclear war." No such left-wing charges have been leveled against

President Johnson, and I think the country in general does and will support the President in any military measure aimed at victory.

The present situation in Vietnam could well escalate into a major and even a nuclear war, if the Chinese Communists pour troops into Vietnam as they did in Korea, and if they are given possession of nuclear warheads by Russia. There is as much reason to believe that Russia will supply nuclear warheads to the Vietcong as there was to supply such warheads to Communist Castro.

The present situation could have been avoided by a responsible administration and a responsible Secretary of Defense. We backed into it through a series of blunders which should not have been made even by a cadet at West Point. I submit some persuasive data:

During the Eisenhower years, from 1954 to 1960 inclusive, this country had no more than 785 military advisers in South Vietnam, and, slowly but surely, with the help and cooperation of President Diem, we were winning the war. In 1961, immediately following the Bay of Pigs fiasco, the war began to escalate and we had 2,000 military men in Vietnam in 1961, 11,000 in 1962, 15,500 in 1963, 18,000 in 1964, and 23,000 by the beginning of 1965.

During the Eisenhower period, not one American boy was killed in Vietnam, but, following the Bay of Pigs, the slaughter began. That dark day in American history was a great turning point for Communist advances. In the eyes of the Asians, we immediately became a paper tiger. To the rest of the world, we said, in fact, that we would not fight Communists 90 miles off our shore. Not only would we not fight them, but the administration agreed to protect Communist Castro from invasion by any country in the Western Hemisphere, and your Navy has been patrolling the water in the Caribbean to prevent any strike or sabotage against Castro.

The erection of the Berlin wall commenced shortly after the Bay of Pigs. We completely failed to capitalize on the Russian-Red Chinese breach, and now the war in South Vietnam has driven them together again. Our State Department mistook the tactical flexibility of the Communist conspiracy for a mellowing of Russian intent to subvert the world, when in truth they have never veered from the goal of total conquest.

In Washington, as well as in many capitals of the world, there is talk of a negotiated peace. This is the pattern we followed in China when Chiang Kai-shek had to leave the mainland and 600 million Chinese fell prey to communism. This is the pattern we followed in Korea, and there has not been a moment of peace since that negotiation. This is the pattern we followed in Laos, and it fell to communism. Under the pattern set by the State Department, so, also, will all of southeast Asia fall to the Communists.

Failure to have total victory, at any cost, will surrender all of southeast Asia to the Communists and close the Indian Ocean to the British Fleet, leaving Australia as a sitting duck for Communist

conquest. So, also, will Malaysia fall, and the next step will be the Philippines, and we will have to withdraw our defenses to Hawaii, or even to our own west coast.

#### HUDSON HIGHLANDS NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been assured by the administration that the President, in encouraging efforts by State and local governments to take action similar to that he proposed for the Potomac River in his national beauty message, was in no way negating the possibility of cooperative Federal action.

Thus, the administration was not in any way ruling out its support for my bill, H.R. 3012, to create a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway, which in fact is presently under study by it.

On the contrary, I have received encouragement from every quarter for this legislation. I have every reason to believe that the Department of the Interior will report favorably on it and that hearings will be held on it at this session. Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY will introduce it in the Senate.

I am extremely gratified and encouraged that the President singled out the Hudson River for specific mention of needed attention in his message. I would be the first to agree that State and local governments must take the primary burden of action to protect their natural resources, rivers, and riverways.

The long neglect of rivers and riverways by the State and local governments, however, has resulted in the despoliation of these resources which abound today. Our potentially most beautiful rivers, like the Hudson, are open sewers, their banks littered with garbage and debris. In my opinion, some sort of Federal stimulant is required to induce State and local governments to take effective action. This is particularly appropriate with respect to our great interstate rivers like the Hudson.

I have every reason to believe that my Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway bill will be successful.

I am pleased, too, with the administration's position on the Consolidated Edison proposed powerplant in Cornwall and with its emphasis on placing future powerlines underground.

#### LIFE TENURE FOR THE JUDGE OF THE U.S. COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago the Congress brought into being the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Our purpose in doing so was to reestablish the American public's confidence in the system of military justice and to guarantee to our servicemen, caught up in the law's toils, as fair a trial as could be had in any court of the United States. Two years ago the Committee on Armed Services reviewed the history of operations under that code, and the contribution to those operations made by the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, the supreme court of the military services. In its report, the committee declared:

Through its opinions, the system of military justice contemplated by the Congress in the uniform code is perfected and explained by the court. Its insistence upon high professional performance by all legal personnel involved in trials by courts-martial, and upon strict compliance with the provisions of the uniform code, has resulted in the elimination of many of the justified grounds for the complaints lodged against the earlier procedures. These results have not only restored to a large extent public confidence in the court-martial system, but have won the support of the Military Establishment as well.

Many of the Members will recall that when we first considered the establishment of this court we provided that the judges would serve during good behavior. The other body, however, modified this by setting a fixed term of years as the judges' tenure, for the evident purpose of providing a period of probation during which we could determine in the crucible of experience the efficacy of our work. Satisfied that the uniform code, under the administration of dedicated, mature and judicious minds, could accomplish our purpose without sacrificing any of our essential needs, we agreed to provide a testing or probationary period.

But, Mr. Speaker, that period of probation is at an end. Two years ago, by a 4 to 1 majority, this House restored the original provision for tenure during good behavior, because we found that both the code and the court has passed every test to which reasonable men can subject them.

The pressures of other business, however, prevented consideration of the measure by the other body before the 88th Congress passed into history.

I am now submitting that proposal again. In so doing, I am fully aware of the reasons advanced by the Committee on Armed Services and relied on by this House as justification for the restoration of life tenure. With each of these indisputably valid reasons, I am in full accord. But I believe the time has come to express the most fundamental, yet simple, reasons of all:

The Court of Military Appeals is a legislative tribunal. It is established for the exclusive purpose of overseeing trials by court-martial under standards fixed by the Congress. During its existence of approximately 14 years, it has established an enviable record among the courts of this land, in the eyes of the members of



the bar generally, and in the minds of servicemen and women as well. Indeed, it has won the accolades of the Military Establishment. Nothing about this court, as a judicial tribunal, is third-rate. It is, in every sense, a first-rate court, and its judges should be treated no differently than judges of the other courts of the United States.

To this end, Mr. Chairman, I am again submitting an amendment to the uniform code designed to restore our original provision for life tenure for these judges, and trust we will speedily enact it into law.

#### MAILING OF DIVIDEND STATEMENTS FOR BENEFIT OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last month many thousands of institutions spent millions of dollars helping the Internal Revenue Service collect taxes on the dividends they paid out to their depositors and account holders. I am referring to the information return required by the Revenue Act of 1962. Under this act, each payor of dividends or interest of \$10 or more is required to mail to each of the persons receiving this amount of money a notice of the amount paid. This is the second year in which this expense requirement has been incurred by small businesses, banks, savings institutions, and other corporations. A substantial part of this expense is the postage required to send the information to millions of individuals.

In a time of the so-called profit squeeze, when the expenses of doing business are rising for nearly every type of business institution, this added burden has been costly. It has to be paid by them; not to develop their business in any way, not to help them make money for their savers or investors, but to help the Government collect income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides that the mailing costs of these millions of information returns to receivers of dividends and interest be paid by the U.S. Treasury which in turn would reimburse the Post Office Department for the postage costs.

I feel that the Congress would be doing the fair and equitable thing to relieve the private financial institutions of this country from a part of the cost of this tax-collecting job. Even with this partial relief, there is still considerable expense involved, since the time of their employees, the stationery costs, and like factors of in-the-office expense would still have to be paid by them. Let us have the job paid for—at least in part—by the Government department which benefits from the service.

The first results of the workings of this law, the spotting by tax collectors

of dividends and interest payments not hitherto reported, are reportedly good. The Treasury is the sole beneficiary of this work of the financial institutions in helping it collect taxes; the system is apparently past the experimental stage and that means it will stay in force. I am convinced that payment by the Treasury for this tax-collecting job, at least in part, is appropriate. It should be provided by Congress before another year rolls around and additional millions of dollars for postage are expended by these institutions in order to comply with the law.

I would like to point out that this is an expense which will not decrease in any foreseeable period. We are in a growing economy. We are trying to keep it growing. Every account added to a savings institution, every new stockholder a corporation acquires will add to the postage burden so that every person is reminded of the dividends or interest of \$10 or more he has received, and to tell the U.S. Treasury that he has received it. I propose that we relieve this unfair burden now by enacting legislation to permit postage-free mail by payor institutions in the mailing of form 1099's, the information returns required by our revenue laws for the benefit of the Internal Revenue Service in its collection job.

#### THE BIRTHDAY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln's Birthday has been an important day to Americans for many years. But, in 1965, it is a particularly significant occasion.

We are now 100 years removed from the death of this great President who died because of his dedication to the American ideals of human freedom and dignity. And we are just 1 year removed from the similarly tragic and violent killing of another great President who worked so hard to translate these same ideals into reality.

Both men fought the evils of bigotry and inequality. Both men won great victories in the continuing battle to make all Americans equal before the law. And both men left a great legacy of unfinished tasks to future generations of Americans.

As we celebrate the anniversary of Lincoln's birth, we must renew our determination to make the American dream, of which Lincoln has become one of the finest symbols, a reality for all. One of the most important actions we could take in this connection would be to eliminate the unjust and discriminatory sections of our immigration laws.

Last year Congress took long needed action to insure that no American will be treated as a second-class citizen because of race. Let us this year take similar action to insure that no group of Americans will feel like second-class citizens because of national origin.

Legislation to accomplish this goal has been asked by President Johnson and is now pending before this body. There could be no finer tribute to the heritage of Lincoln than swift passage of a new immigration law.

#### NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART VI

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues part VI of the New York Herald Tribune series on "New York City in Crisis." This installment deals with the huge loss of middle-class families in New York City due to the poor housing situation and appeared in the Herald Tribune on January 27, 1965.

The article follows:

#### CITY EXODUS TO SUBURBS

(By Barry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

The only piece of furniture in the living room of Paul and Sondra Levine's split-level home in Merrick, Long Island, is a \$1,000 grand piano. The piano is a gift from Sondra's parents. Since buying the \$25,000 home in April of 1963, the Levines have been forced to move extremely slowly.

Yet, after nearly 2 years of partially furnished rooms and severe financial problems, the Levines have no thoughts of returning to New York City. Like thousands and thousands of other New Yorkers, the Levines have learned that the city no longer has any place for a middle-income family.

"We're city people, we always have been," says Paul Levine. "Three years ago when we decided to move because we needed more room, we had no idea of moving out of the city. But we gave up the fight. The way it adds up, the city alienates people in our circumstances. It's getting harder and harder for people such as ourselves, middle-income with children, to stay in the city."

Paul Levine is a promising young accountant, and he and his wife, both college graduates, have three children. They are precisely the kind of family a healthy city needs to attract and to keep. Yet, after 9 months of searching for a suitable apartment in Manhattan, Queens, Brooklyn and the Bronx, the Levines gave up—and joined the ranks of the 800,000 middle-class whites who have deserted the city for the suburbs since 1950.

They are all victims of the city's indifference, the high cost of adequate housing and the low state of public education. And their defection to the suburbs—into financial problems and the commuter mess which directly affected their future and the future of the city—is a bold example of New York's failure.

"We must do something to keep our young middle class," says Mayor Robert F. Wagner. It is obvious \* \* \* that a great many young families would stay in the city if apartments were larger and less expensive, if schools



were better, if the streets and parks were safer, and if the public transportation were less painful. Yet just where the city starts to solve its multiple housing, education, safety and transportation problems staggers the imagination of the mayor and anyone else who would like to replace him.

#### A PIMPLE ON CITY'S FACE

According to one city official, the loss of the middle class is only a pimple on the face of the city, a serious one yet no more than a pimple. Before the city can hope to eliminate the pimple, it must first locate, then treat, and finally wipe out the infection that is causing it.

"We must get to the basic sickness," says Julius C. C. Edelstein, the mayor's chief aid. "That is exactly what we are trying to do right now in New York. There are no easy solutions when the problems are this great."

Yet while the city struggles in search of the big answers, as Mr. Edelstein believes, or merely sleeps, as a great many others believe, more and more young middle class New York whites are leaving or giving serious thought to leaving. At one recent Christmas party of 36 middle-class New Yorkers, 18 already had left the city, 12 were thinking about it, and only 6 seemed content in Manhattan, and 2 of these are bachelors.

Depending on the family, it is the problems of housing or education that generally force the decision to desert. In the case of Paul and Sondra Levine, it happened to be a combination of the two.

Paul Levine, a 31-year-old graduate of Brooklyn College, earns slightly more than \$10,000 a year as a certified public accountant with Siminoff, Peyser, and Citrin, a mid-Manhattan accounting firm.

Married in June 1958, he and his wife first moved into a 3½-room, \$110-a-month apartment in Jackson Heights. When their second child was born 3 years later, they decided to move into a larger apartment in the same building, paying \$135 a month for two bedrooms. But, even with two bedrooms, the walls, as they are in most new buildings, were paper-thin and the rooms were tiny—and it wasn't long before they decided to look for a still larger apartment.

"Besides there just wasn't any place for the children to play," says Sondra Levine, a graduate of NYU and a former public school teacher. "They had to be taken down by elevator and there really was no place to take them. No park nearby."

Commuting was also a problem. Driving was immediately eliminated as a means of Paul's getting to work. In the first place, Sondra needed the car to shop. In the second, traffic on the Long Island highways is unbearable and parking in New York is too expensive (from \$1.50 to \$3) on a regular basis.

#### THE NIGHTMARE AT RUSH HOUR

Though the ride on the IRT Flushing line took only 25 minutes, passengers were backed up in the hundreds waiting to push their way into the station each morning and then jammed like sardines for the trip to work. For anyone forced to travel during rush hours—and Paul Levine was—transportation was a nightmare.

"It's pretty damned bad when you arrive at a subway station in the morning and can't even get in," says Paul. "They've been building big apartments in Queens, but the city hasn't alleviated the transportation system there. This is a typical lack of city planning."

When the Levines started looking for a larger apartment, they went about it systematically. They felt they could afford to pay \$200 a month rent and, with two children already and a third on the way, they felt they needed a minimum of three bedrooms. What they found during their 9 months of searching was depressing.

In Manhattan, the new apartments were out of the question—with most one-bedroom starting at \$170—and the older, larger and more reasonably priced apartments, particularly those on the upper West Side, are nearly impossible to find. And parking, they soon discovered, starts at \$15 a month and goes considerably higher.

Several times they bought Sunday newspapers on Saturday night to get a head start, only to find a long waiting list of people at the advertised apartments by the time they got there early Sunday morning.

Though they did not want to live in some projects and, because of their income, they did not qualify to live in some others, they learned that it is nearly impossible to get into the better ones. At Stuyvesant Town, attractive three-bedroom apartments rent from \$169 to \$186 a month. Yet, when vacancies do occur (and this is seldom), the three-bedroom apartments are immediately rented to other Stuyvesant Town residents who are seeking larger quarters. As it is, there is presently a waiting list of more than 400 families for one- and two-bedroom apartments in this project.

At Parkchester, a development in the Bronx, where the rents and the apartments are both smaller, the waiting list is even larger and longer.

In Queens and Brooklyn, rents for what the Levines wanted started at \$230 a month. And in many places, they discovered that landlords advertised three-bedroom apartments without mentioning that the third bedroom was the size of a large closet.

The closest the Levines came to settling in New York came when they left a \$50 deposit on a convertible three-bedroom cooperative (the dining room could be turned into the third bedroom). The buying price was \$3,500, more than they had anticipated spending, but the rent, \$190 a month, was within their budget.

It looked like a good buy until Paul Levine, an accountant, who is more exact about his finances than most people, studied it further. In the first place, he discovered parking facilities were extremely limited.

In the second, he learned the same builders were putting up a noncooperative apartment house right across the street from the two co-ops.

"I found they were offering concessions to get people into the other place—sign a lease and get 3 months' free occupancy," says Paul Levine. "It appeared to me that it might become a buyer's market and then what would happen to my equity in the co-op? If a buyer's market developed for rents in the neighborhood, the value of my apartment would drop and eventually the area would become less desirable. Where would my equity be?"

Housing was clearly the primary reason for the Levines' decision to leave the city, but education was a close second. Sondra Levine had taught at PS 170 in Harlem several years before and it gave her an impression of the public school system that she will never forget.

"The first day of school I was told that all I was expected to do my first year was keep my children quiet—not teach them," she says. "I was told that was all I had to worry about, keeping the classes in order, nothing else. Really, all we were expected to do was to get the children to walk through the halls more or less quietly. If we could do that, we had succeeded. I kept my pupils quiet."

Though both Levines feel that Queens schools are superior to those elsewhere in the city, they are both opposed to busing. If they hadn't moved to Merrick, their daughter, Karen, would be starting in the Queens public school system this fall, with the possibility of attending a paired school. In Merrick, Karen will be bused to school but, her father adds, "to the nearest neighborhood school."

"This busing is not right," says Paul Levine. "I am for integrated education because of the greater interests that a variety of backgrounds brings to all children. But I'm against busing children from one place to another. There's something repugnant about it. Why should parents who have worked hard to move into a neighborhood, to assure their children of good schools nearby, have to see their children carted off to a school farther away? It's not right for the parents and it's certainly not right for the children. I think education in New York is going downhill."

Because of their limited income, the Levines did not give serious thought to private schools. Lewis Zacks, a successful, 33-year-old commercial artist who earns approximately \$15,000 a year, has. The Zacks and their two young sons live in one of the large, old and usually unavailable apartments on the upper West Side of Manhattan. Theirs became available 3 years ago. "It's simple," says Lew Zacks. "My wife just told every doorman and super within 30 blocks that we were interested in a 3-bedroom apartment and would take care of them."

#### HOW TO GET AN APARTMENT

Within a month, the Zacks received a phone call, the super at 55 West End Avenue. (he is no longer there) received a \$100 check for cash and the couple moved into a 5½-room, \$210-a-month apartment.

That was 3 years ago. Today, the Zacks' elder son, Daniel, who will be 6 next week, is ready to enter school next fall. For the past 3 years, he has been attending a nursery school. For the past 2 years, he and his mother, Irene, an attractive 29-year-old who works 5 mornings a week for a talent manager, have been making the rounds of Manhattan's private schools.

Private schools have become a big business in New York during the last decade. As public schools have fallen in the middle-class favor (the elementary schools in the Bronx and Manhattan are now more than 60-percent Negro and Puerto Rican), the city's private schools have grown in number, exclusiveness and price. Horace Mann, one of the city's better private schools, delights in telling its elder graduates that, with few exceptions, they would have extreme difficulty in gaining entrance today.

There are more than 60 accredited private schools in Manhattan (most in the \$1,200-a-year price range) and, after eliminating those with social and religious restrictions, the Zacks applied to six schools.

Though they haven't heard from any of the schools yet, the Zacks have just about given up hope. At the Trinity School, Daniel, a bright youngster, was given a 20-minute intelligence test and a 15-minute personal interview to try and draw him out.

"What do you like to do?" the interviewer asked.

"Swim," answered Daniel.

"How far can you swim?" he asked.

"I don't know," answered the youngster.

"We have a pool downstairs," said the interviewer. "How far do you think you could swim in it?"

"How big is the pool?" answered Daniel. That brought the interview to an end.

Though the Zacks have not yet experienced it, they have been told by friends that several private schools now go so far as to mail out announcements of their building funds before reaching a decision on an applicant. "It may surprise you at first," says one father, "but after you've been through it with one kid, you know that they can afford to be selective. Maybe you don't have to buy your way in, but let's say a contribution doesn't hurt."

If Daniel Zacks is not accepted into a top private school, his parents have decided to send him to P.S. 9, a brandnew school that will open this fall. It is a 10-minute walk



from the Zacks' apartment, but, because of the neighborhood's side streets (which have grown increasingly dangerous in the past 5 years) and the traffic (he will have to cross Broadway to get to and from school), someone will have to take him to school and pick him up each day.

"We've given this considerable thought and we've decided that we do not want to leave Manhattan," says Irene Zacks. "My husband likes living close to work and we like being near the park, the museums, the stores, and our friends. We're going to stay and try to fight it. But if the schools are as bad as some people say, we don't have much choice. You begin to wonder if the city is even willing to meet you halfway. We're going to try—that's all. But it's not easy being optimistic."

#### SUBURBIA HAS DRAWBACKS, TOO

What the Levines have already learned and the Zackses fear about suburbia is that there is no truly idyllic existence for the young middle class. What they're getting into isn't always that much better than what they're fleeing. The schools may be better in suburbia, but the transportation is an extreme and worsening problem and the cost of owning a home tends to overwhelm the young middle-class family, stripping them of their privacy and their savings.

For Paul Levine, the move to suburbia has meant far more than a partially furnished living room and extremely limited spending power. He is now a commuter, who must drive a few miles to the Freeport station each morning (her parents bought them a compact car which Sondra Levine uses as a second car) and then ride a minimum of 40 minutes by train into the city.

In the year and a half he has lived in Merrick, the monthly fare on the Long Island Railroad has already jumped from \$34.85 a month to \$37.55 and, according to current estimates, will probably climb considerably higher.

Compared to the jammed highways, the Long Island is a rare treat for Paul—a seat each way and a bridge game most mornings. Yet he also has found it less dependable—so much so that he has made a practice of leaving a half-hour early each morning to insure arriving at his appointments on time.

But to Paul and the 200,000 others, depending on the Long Island, the New York Central, or the New Haven to get them to their offices each weekday, the irregularities of the service are only an inconvenience.

What troubles them—and threatens their entire investment in suburbia—is the shaky and uncertain future of all the commuter lines. Should the lines fold or be forced to seriously curtail their commuter service, 200,000 New Yorkers would suddenly find themselves without means of transportation to and from work.

They obviously can't drive because the roads are already overflowing with cars. How else are they going to get to work?

Yet, compared to the problems that concern the middle-class family determined to remain in the city, the problems of suburbia seem far less overpowering. The commuter problem is indeed critical but most people feel it can be solved by increased Federal funds and new controls. The problems of the city are not that easily resolved.

"You've either got to have a lot of money and not care about anything but the pollution and the dirty streets and the architecture or have no money and become wards of the city," says one young lawyer. "Otherwise the city doesn't give a damn about you."

Though the mayor and the city administration repeatedly announce that they do give a damn about New York's young middle class, their record clearly indicates that they obviously don't care enough. It may be only a pimple but, if the middle class keeps de-

serting the city, Manhattan will be left with only the very rich and the indigent and unskilled nonwhites. It is a vicious cycle, but a start—to keep the young middle class from moving elsewhere—must be made somewhere.

#### THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF VIRGINIA UNION UNIVERSITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to extend my congratulations to Virginia Union University on the occasion of its 100th birthday. Virginia Union is an accredited liberal arts college and graduate school of religion in my congressional district at Richmond, Va. Tomorrow, in activities throughout the day, this fine institution will mark a century of educational work with a progressive look toward the future.

Following a founders' day convocation address by Dr. Horace Mann Bond, who is dean of the School of Education of Atlanta University, Virginia Union President Dr. Thomas Howard Henderson will discuss with alumni and friends at a founders' day luncheon the university's challenging and imaginative development program.

Dr. W. H. Johnson, a Philadelphia physician who is president of the Virginia Union Alumni Association, and Dr. John L. S. Holloman, Jr., a New York physician who is president of the school's board of trustees, are leading the drive for funds to carry out Union's first major expansion in 65 years.

Virginia Union was founded in 1865 by the American Baptist Home Mission Society under the names of Richmond Theological Institute for Freedmen and Wayland Seminary. These schools united in 1899. In 1932 Hartshorn Memorial College was made a part of the university and in 1964 Storer College of Harpers Ferry, W. Va., was added to the educational complex.

The university is a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the University Center in Virginia, an associated member of the American Association of Theological Schools, and a member of the Association of American Colleges, the American Council on Education, and the United Negro College Fund.

In recognition of the Virginia Union centennial, I would like to include the following brief history and background of the school:

Virginia Union University is an accredited, coeducational, liberal arts college and graduate school of religion which resulted from the merger in 1899 of two institutions which had been established in 1865 by the American Baptist Home Mission Societies. It is independent of governmental support, deriving its church support from Baptists and other support from alumni, philanthropists, and the United Negro College Fund, a fundraising federation of more than 30 accredited private institutions.

The focus of the university is on the development of strong religious convictions and commitments but insists on rigorous intellectual discipline. The basic rule of the university is that students must deport themselves at all times as ladies or gentlemen and Christian citizens. As a Christian institution, the university family includes alumni, students, and teachers from many denominations, both sexes, and several countries and racial or ethnic groups.

As a liberal arts college the university emphasizes well-rounded intellectual development but, in facing the economic realities of its typical student, attempts to insure that each graduate is prepared either for some vocation or professional school. Because the university is zealous of maintaining a high standing in the educational world, it seeks to enroll and to send out only those who give promise of intellectual and spiritual leadership. Its program assumes that its graduates will pursue higher academic and professional degrees, and it takes pride in the high proportion of its alumni who hold earned doctorates.

The university is located on a spacious 55-acre campus in the heart of Richmond, a historic city whose cultural resources, commercial establishments, and fine religious and educational institutions offer unusual broadening advantages. Approximately half the Virginia Union students are from homes in the Richmond area.

With a current enrollment of 1,100, the university is planning for an enrollment of 1,500 in the next 10 years. Two new residence halls, a student union, and a science-language building are planned for the immediate future. The second phase of the centennial development program includes plans for a fine arts building and a larger auditorium.

#### VA PROGRAMS MUST BE EFFECTIVELY ADMINISTERED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill (H.R. 4856) to provide for the continued operation of certain Veterans' Administration offices, and that records relating to beneficiaries of veterans programs be kept within the several States in order that VA programs affecting such beneficiaries can be economically and effectively administered.

My bill seeks to provide long-term relief to the several States, including Delaware, which, under the recently promulgated VA order, will lose VA offices now providing substantial and direct advice and assistance in the administration of programs for veterans who are residents of such States.

It should be obvious to Federal budget and VA officials that certain records must be maintained in the several States in order to economically and effectively administer VA programs, and that such records must remain within the States until they are determined to be obsolete and are earmarked for removal to central VA storage space.

The Congress declared long ago that there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans of any war and to that end

Congress directed the Secretary of Labor to assign to each of the States a veterans employment representative. As a result, each State has a veterans employment representative and his responsibilities encompass the veterans resident in each State.

In response to my own protests to the VA on this VA order, I was informed that the consolidation of the Wilmington, Del., office, and others, is based on the Administration's desire to streamline VA administrative arrangements at the regional level, thereby effecting certain economies.

I am convinced that the VA's hastily conceived and promulgated order will, if put into operation, grievously impair the administration of VA programs and services to veterans and their beneficiaries. Now is the time to prevent this happening.

The closing of VA offices, and the transferring of records, is not conducive to effective and efficient VA administration. In the case of the Wilmington, Del., VA office, for instance, a smaller staff will be retained, while the records necessary and essential to efficient administration of VA programs will be transferred to Philadelphia.

The economies and improvement of efficiency which such a transfer of essential records may bring about, while claimed, have yet to be proven to me. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee will begin hearings on this matter on February 18, and so it is clear that the claimed economies, and improvement of efficiency, have not been proven to others as well.

If the present course is continued it can reasonably be expected that it will be only a matter of time, and probably only a short time at that, when these standby staffs in the State VA offices will be reduced to one receptionist with a telephone and a typewriter, and a timetable showing when the next bus, train, or airplane leaves for the consolidated VA office in some distant city. The receptionists will not be able to offer direct assistance and advice to needy resident veterans based upon immediate access to applicable files and records, because the applicable files and records will be hundreds of miles away.

I hope that any colleague of mine from either party interested in cosponsoring my bill will feel free to do so, and I include its text here as part of my remarks for the information of all of the Members of this House.

#### H.R. 4856

A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the continued operation of certain Veterans' Administration offices and that records relating to beneficiaries under that title be kept within the State of their residence in order that programs affecting such beneficiaries can be most economically and effectively administered.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 230(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall continue to operate each Veterans'

Administration office that was in being on January 1, 1965."

SEC. 2. (a) Subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3305. WHERE CERTAIN RECORDS MUST BE KEPT.

"No records of the Veterans' Administration relating to veterans or other persons entitled to or receiving benefits under this title in any State, which were kept within such State on January 1, 1965, shall be transferred outside of such State, unless for storage by reason of obsolescence."

(b) The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"3305. Where certain records must be kept."

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBINSON.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST. ONGE.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 60. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 301. An act to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and main-

tain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 491. An act to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 794. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 15, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

565. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report indicating the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

566. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

567. A letter from the Assistance Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

568. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

569. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.



570. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the transfer of funds to the construction of facilities appropriation, pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1965 (78 Stat. 310, 311); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

571. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the transfer of funds to the construction of facilities appropriation, pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1965 (78 Stat. 310, 311); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 4845. A bill to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4846. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the benefits payable thereunder shall be exempt from all taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4847. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefit payable thereunder to \$75; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 4848. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, so as to authorize the free use of the mails in making reports required by law of certain payments to others; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4850. A bill to provide life tenure for the judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4851. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 4852. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territory of Guam shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the treatment of certain sets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 4854. A bill to provide research, technical, and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers' excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags, to reduce and eventually repeal the manufacturers' excise taxes on passenger automobiles and automotive parts and accessories (with the proceeds going in the meanwhile to the highway trust fund), and to repeal the tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4856. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the continued operation of certain Veterans' Administration offices and that records relating to beneficiaries under that title be kept within the State of their residence in order that programs affecting such beneficiaries can be most economically and effectively administered; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4857. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 4858. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the anniversary of the birth of the late Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.J. Res. 314. Joint resolution relative to Bennett Place commemoration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that a State having a bicameral legislature may apportion membership in one House of the legislature on other than population basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs being requested to rescind his decision to close the Alaska regional office; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Lawrence E. Gardner, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4860. A bill for the relief of Loi Sing Yip, his wife Szeto Pik Shun Yip, and their minor son Koon Ying Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4861. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Boulder County, Colo., to W. F. Stover; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

97. Mr. OLSEN of Montana presented a petition of the Missoula County United Veterans Council resolving against the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Miles City, Mont., which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Boy Scout Week

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Boy Scout Anniversary Week is a most stimulating experience. Seeing the throngs of rugged and enthusiastic youngsters in uniform around Capitol Hill always instills a new confidence in the future of our country. The way things have been going in this old world for the past quarter of a century might ordinarily shake the assurance of those who must inherit the job of carrying on, but hope will rise and mankind in general will en-

joy a better life if the philosophy of the Boy Scouts of America is extended and accepted through a greater part of the universe.

No creed can have a higher purpose when it is based on service to God, to country, and to fellow man. From its inception more than half a century ago, the Boy Scout organization has dedicated itself to the teaching of love of God, patriotism, courage, understanding of and consideration for others, and self-reliance. By encouraging youths to achieve excellence in whatever careers their character and ability enable them to qualify, the Scouts have produced outstanding individuals in every field of endeavor.

As one whose love of nature has steadfastly grown from my first memory of walking through the woods with my father, I have a particular admiration

for the Scouting programs which, by the simple expedient of experience, acquaint these boys with the wondrous gifts our Creator bestowed when he designed forests and mountains and trickling streams, then topped them all with an astronomical arrangement through which heat and energy is provided and stored by day and a magical and brilliant showpiece is unveiled at sundown. To tramp through the woods not only makes for healthy bodies; it develops moral fiber by nurturing an appreciation for the accomplishments of the pioneers who hewed the path that led to the miracle that is today's America.

With the progress that brings more leisure time, hiking and campouts should be encouraged wherever possible. They are infinitely more beneficial to physical and mental development than a young man will find at a soda counter, on a